

2016 District Accreditation Assignments

Request to Reconsideration Summary

Pursuant to the Education Accountability Act of 2009

The Education Accountability Act of 2009 requires the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) to evaluate all districts and schools based on their level of attainment on key performance indicators: academic achievement, academic growth, and postsecondary and workforce readiness. State-identified measures and metrics for each of these performance indicators are combined to arrive at an overall evaluation of a district's or a school's performance. For districts, the overall evaluation leads to their accreditation category. For schools, the overall evaluation leads to the type of improvement plan schools will implement. Districts accredit schools, and they may do so using the state's performance framework or using their own more comprehensive or stringent framework, provided it correlates with CDE's plan types. The results of these evaluations are reported annually through customized district performance framework (DPF) reports and school performance framework (SPF) reports for each district and school.

Prior to finalizing the DPF and SPF reports, districts had the opportunity to indicate if they disagreed with any of the Department's initial district accreditation categories or initial school plan type assignments. If, in reviewing the performance of the district overall, or an individual school, a different accreditation rating or plan type assignment better describes the performance of students in the district or school, then the district should engage in the request to reconsider process. The Department will only consider requests that meet one or more of the conditions for a request to reconsider, as outlined in [policy guidance](#), in assigning a different district accreditation category or school plan type from the initial rating given through the District or School Performance Framework (DPF/SPF) report. Districts must follow the process outlined in [policy guidance](#) on how to submit a request to reconsider, which includes submitting a statement addressed to the Commissioner and data outlined through the request to reconsider template, if applicable.

A cross-unit CDE team reviewed each request to reconsider. CDE staff evaluated the extent to which the requests met the conditions and data criteria outlined in the [Request to Reconsider guidance](#). The staff then made a recommendation to the Commissioner as to each district's final accreditation category and/or each school's plan type. Final district accreditation categories were determined by the Commissioner by December 15, 2016 and the State Board will consider and adopt final plan type assignments for each school by January 12, 2017. Additional details on this process are described in the [Colorado District Accountability Handbook](#).

The tables that follow summarize the formal District requests to reconsider received by the Department by November 7, 2016 and their resolution as approved by the Commissioner or the State Board of Education, as applicable. It outlines CDE's initial district accreditation category or initial school plan type assignment based on the DPF results, the district's alternate requested accreditation category, and the district's rationale for the request. It then presents the final accreditation and plan type determination made by CDE, and the rationale for the decision. This final accreditation category is the one reported on the district's performance framework report.

Glossary of Terms used in Request to Reconsider Summaries

For additional definitions, please refer to the [Colorado District Accountability Handbook](#), Appendix A: Colorado Educational Accountability System Terminology.

District Performance Framework (DPF)	The framework used by the state to provide information to stakeholders about each district's performance on four key performance indicators: student achievement, student academic growth, growth gaps, and postsecondary readiness. Districts are assigned an accreditation category based on their performance across all of the indicator areas, as well as participation rates and financial and safety assurances. The district's results on the district performance framework are summarized in the district performance framework (DPF) report.
School Performance Framework (SPF)	The framework used by the state to provide information to stakeholders about each school's performance on four key performance indicators: student achievement, student academic growth, growth gaps, and postsecondary readiness. Schools are assigned to a type of improvement plan based on their performance across all of the indicator areas, as well as participation rates. The school's results on the performance framework are summarized in the school performance framework (SPF) report.
Median Growth Percentile (MGP)	Summarizes student growth by district, school, grade-level, or other group of interest. It is calculated by taking the individual Student Growth Percentiles of the students in the group of interest and calculating the median.
Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS) - English Language Arts and Mathematics Assessments (PARCC)	In compliance with legislation, Colorado joined the PARCC consortium as a governing member in August 2012. PARCC is a multi-state assessment consortium that is developing shared English language arts/literacy (ELA/L) and mathematics assessments. About 10 states participate in the consortium. As a governing member, Colorado is committed to relying on the PARCC assessment system for grades 3-9.
Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS) - Science and Social Studies Assessments	The Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS): Science and Social Studies assessments is administered in elementary, middle, and high schools. Students in grades 5, 8, and 11 will take the science assessments. The social studies assessments will be administered in grades 4 and 7 on a sampling basis to one-third of the schools.
Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP)	Measures of Academic Progress (MAP®) MAP Assessments for grades K-12 are available aligned to the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS). MAP Mathematics, Reading, and Language Usage tests are appropriate for students in grades 2-12. NWEA also offers MAP in mathematics and reading for students in grades K-2, and MAP for Science for grades 3-9. Note: NWEA also offers MAP for Common Core State Standards (CCSS), among other standards. These assessments share the same stable RIT scales which are consistent from previous versions of the instruments. The tables included in this document reference only the Colorado Academic Standards aligned MAP assessments. More information about NWEA MAP can be found here .
Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Next	DIBELS Next includes six measures intended to be used as indicators of the essential skills that every child must master to become a proficient reader. An indicator is a brief, efficient index that provides a fair degree of certainty about a larger, more complex system or process. The measures indicate which students are experiencing difficulty acquiring basic early literacy skills so that support can be provided early to prevent later reading difficulties. The measures help teachers identify areas to target with instructional support and can be used to monitor the students while they receive targeted supported. The measures can also be used at the classroom, school, and district level to examine the effectiveness of the system of support. More information about DIBELS can be found here .
Developmental Reading Assessment 2nd edition (DRA2)	DRA2 enables primary teachers to systematically observe, record, and evaluate changes in student reading performance. DRA2 provides teachers with information that helps teachers determine each student's independent reading level and identify what the student needs to learn next. The DRA Word Analysis is a diagnostic assessment that provides classroom and reading teachers with a systematic means to observe how struggling and emerging readers attend to and work with the various components of spoken and written words. It is intended to support teachers to: 1. Determine students' level of control of various word analysis tasks. 2. Document students' progress over time. 3. Group students according to their instructional needs. 4. Plan more effectively for instruction. More information about DRA2 can be found here .

STAR Early Learning, STAR Early Literacy Enterprise™, STAR Reading Enterprise™, and STAR Math Enterprise™	<p>STAR Early Learning is comprised of two computer adaptive tests: STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading. STAR Early Literacy assesses the early literacy skills of young learners in grades pre-kindergarten through 3. STAR Reading assesses reading comprehension of independent readers in grades K-3. Together, these assessments provide accurate data along the continuum of skill development from pre-reading through independent reading. STAR Early Learning assessments can be used for a number of purposes, including screening, standards benchmarking, and progress monitoring. Skills-based reports, accessible immediately after students complete an assessment, help teachers plan instruction. The Core Progress learning progression for reading, shared by both STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading, connects educators with instructional resources that can be used to differentiate instruction for all students. Like the Colorado state test, STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading report student growth percentile (SGP), developed in consultation with Dr. Damian Betebenner. More information about STAR Early Learning can be found here.</p> <p>STAR Reading is a student-based, computer adaptive assessment for measuring student achievement in reading. STAR fulfills a variety of assessment purposes, including interim assessment, screening, standards benchmarking, skills-based reporting and instructional planning, and progress monitoring. STAR Reading is by far the most widely used reading assessment in K12 schools. Educators get valid, reliable, actionable data in about 15 minutes. More information about STAR Reading can be found here.</p> <p>STAR Math is a student-based, computer adaptive assessment for measuring student achievement in math. STAR fulfills a variety of assessment purposes, including interim assessment, screening, standards benchmarking, skills-based reporting and instructional planning, and progress monitoring. More information about STAR Math can be found here.</p>
Acuity	<p>Diagnose student strengths and areas for improvement relative to your state standards Acuity Predictive Assessments are designed to: 1. Forecast student performance on the state exam; 2. Focus instructional strategies on content areas most in need of attention; and 3. Measure student growth and progress within and across grades. More information about Acuity can be found here.</p>
Aimsweb	<p>Aimsweb is the leading assessment and RTI solution in school today—a complete web-based solution for universal screening, progress monitoring, and data management for Grades K-12. Aimsweb provides guidance to administrators and teachers based on accurate, continuous, and direct student assessment. More information about Aimsweb can be found here.</p>
Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST)	<p>FAST is a suite of highly efficient, instructionally relevant screening, progress monitoring, and data reporting tools for reading (English, K-12; Spanish, K-6), math (K-6), Behavior (K-12), and Developmental Milestones (K). FAST offers schools both Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) tools and Computer Adaptive Tests (CAT) to help identify and support all students' needs. Highly reliable and valid, FAST's CCSS-aligned assessments help identify students at-risk for success in reading and math. Students of concern may be frequently monitored through FAST to track progress and measure instructional efficacy. More information about FAST can be found here.</p>
i-Ready® Diagnostic	<p>i-Ready® is a web-based adaptive diagnostic assessment and instruction program. i-Ready assesses students' reading skills to the sub-domain level, prescribing differentiated Common Core instruction so learners of all abilities can achieve success. The diagnostic assessment identifies which students are experiencing difficulties with specific skills, providing real-time, actionable data and reports to guide teachers in effective intervention. In addition, i-Ready provides intuitive resources for targeted instructional support, including downloadable, teacher-directed lesson plans (included with purchase of i-Ready Diagnostic), and highly engaging online lesson modules in i-Ready Instruction (optional). The assessment can also be leveraged at the classroom, school, and district levels to evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction or intervention measures. More information about i-Ready can be found here.</p>
iStation	<p>Istation is designed to: 1. Identify children at risk for reading difficulties, 2. Provide automatic continuous progress monitoring of skills that are predictors of later reading success, and 3. Provide immediate and automatic linkage of assessment data to student learning needs, which facilitates differentiated instruction. More information about Istation can be found here.</p>

Galileo	Galileo K-12 Online includes an integrated comprehensive assessment system aligned to state standards in a variety of content areas including Common Core State Standards and Colorado Assessment Standards. Galileo assessments and item types (including technology-enhanced item types) are designed to reflect the guidelines released by statewide assessment consortia such as Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC). Galileo provides the capability to administer (online, offline, and via handheld wireless devices) multiple types of prebuilt and customized district, school, and classroom assessments (e.g., interim benchmark, pretest/posttest, placement, end-of-course) in a wide variety of content areas (e.g., English language arts, math, writing, science, social studies, art, music). This description focuses on Galileo pre-built and customized interim benchmark assessments. Galileo interim benchmark assessments are designed to provide information about student standards mastery, to support the measurement of student growth, and to predict student performance on the statewide test. More information about Galileo can be found here .
Scantron Performance Series ®	Performance Series is a research-based, criterion-referenced computer-adaptive test that lets K-12 educators quickly pinpoint the instructional level of students across a range of subjects – not just Reading and Mathematics, capture immediate results, and produce standards-based reports including suggested learning objectives, on a scaled score. More information about Scantron can be found here .
Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS)	The Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS) is a research-based screening, diagnostic, and progress monitoring tool. Teachers can use PALS to identify students at risk of developing reading difficulties, diagnose students' knowledge of literacy fundamentals, monitor progress, and plan instruction that targets students' needs. More information on PALS can be found here .
PSAT	The PSAT 10 tests the same skills and knowledge as the SAT in a way that makes sense for 10th-graders. It builds on the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) tests in literacy and mathematics and the Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS) tests in science and social studies. The PSAT 10 also aligns with Colorado Academic Standards (CAS) and with the SAT that students will take in 11th grade. The PSAT focuses on the knowledge, skills, and understandings that research has identified as most important for college and career readiness and success. In addition to helping sophomores practice for the SAT, it can identify student's potential for success in advanced course work. It provides more data than ever before about academic strengths and weaknesses as well as access to millions of dollars in scholarships. More information on PSAT can be found here .

2016 District Requests to Reconsider

Summary of Requests and Decisions

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Body of Evidence	ADAMS 14	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	Accredited with Turnaround Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Adams 14 made its request to be Accredited with an Improvement Plan on a number of different criteria. First, the district requested that all WiDA ACCESS data be removed from the district performance framework because the 2015 data is not reflective of the significant efforts put in place to support English language development between 2015 and 2016. Second, the district submitted one year of supplemental growth data as a body of evidence of student performance. The district states that their STAR Early Literacy, Reading and Math growth data for grades K-3 and 10-12 demonstrates students are approaching or meeting state expectations. Third, Adams 14 requested that their Alternative Education Campus (AEC), Lester R. Arnold High School, be removed from the district performance framework because the school saw improved performance between 2012 and 2014. Lastly, the district requested that if the AEC is removed from the district framework that the high school portion of the framework reflect the rating of Adams City High School, following the request to reconsider that was submitted on behalf of that high school.	Deny	A cross-department team at CDE reviewed the request and made the following determinations. CDE has removed the English Language Proficiency data (2015 WiDA ACCESS) from the Academic Growth indicator at all levels, per the district's request. The district submitted additional data on local assessments and while a portion of the submitted STAR growth data from 2016 showed students meeting state expectations, overall, the data across grade levels and content areas did not present a compelling case of performance that warrants a higher accreditation rating. Supplemental data for non-state tested grades K-3 and 10-12 was provided only for the growth indicator; achievement data was provided just for 10 th graders (PSAT). Without evidence of how students are faring in non-state tested grades for the academic achievement indicator, the submitted body of evidence is not conclusive. CDE does not approve Adams 14's request to remove its Alternative Education Campus, Lester R. Arnold High School, from the district framework because the school has not shown consistent improvement across all indicators when comparing the AEC 2014 framework to the AEC 2016 framework. Additionally, the matriculation and PSAT data put forward by the district did not result in any additional points on the district performance framework. Finally, looking at overall performance, the district saw declines in school performance from 2014 to 2016. Four schools entered Priority Improvement or Turnaround status. Of the schools that were already on the clock, all continued to be on the clock. Of the two schools in the district that based on the preliminary ratings were not Priority Improvement or Turnaround, decreased from Performance to Improvement.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Body of Evidence, AEC Exclusion from DPF	ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan	The district made its request on a number of different criteria. First, the district requests that its Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) be excluded from the calculations used to determine the district performance framework accreditation rating as per SB 13-217 and State Board Rules 4.01 (D). Secondly, the district requests the exclusion of New America School's graduation data, as the school is no longer authorized by the district. Third, the district requests the exclusion of 8 mis-scored PARCC assessments. Fourth, the district requests that all data from Fletcher Elementary School be excluded from the calculations used to determine the district performance framework accreditation rating due to its recent conversion to a charter school. And finally, the district requests that all data from Aurora Central High School (ACHS) be excluded from the calculations used to determine the district performance framework accreditation rating due to recent restructuring.	Deny	As per SB 13-217 and State Board Rules 4.01 (D), CDE staff calculated the impact of 4.01 (D)(1) for the DPF and the district would not move up an accreditation category. Additionally, the AEC in the district, APS Online, received a Priority Improvement rating on the AEC SPF for the 2016 school year, and thus, removal of this AEC from the DPF calculations would not qualify as per 4.01(D)(2). Although the district is responsible for graduation data for the New America School for the period the school was authorized by the district and the district is not held accountable for the graduation of students when the school has switched authorizers, the request to exclude New America School's graduation data is accepted, however, this would not have an impact on changing the accreditation rating. CDE accepts the exclusion of the 8 mis-coded PARCC assessment data does not impact the district's overall performance framework accreditation rating. Aurora Public Schools is the authorizer for Fletcher Elementary School, Aurora Central High School (ACHS), and thus, Aurora Public Schools is responsible for student performance in all authorized schools and cannot exclude those students from the district performance calculations. Thus, the request to exclude Fletcher Elementary School and Aurora Central High School (ACHS), from the district performance calculations is denied. Additionally, ACHS has retained its location, school code and students, and does not fall under the "school closure" criteria of a request to reconsider submission.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Body of Evidence, Participation Miscoding, Dropout, Graduation, and Matriculation Data	COLORADO DIGITAL BOCES	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited with Turnaround Plan: Decreased Due to Participation	Accredited with Improvement Plan	The district made its request on the grounds that its participation rate was over 95% when participation was aggregated at the district level, that the participation rates, when parent excusal miscoding was corrected was above 95% in ELA and Math, that district internal assessment data are more accurate than the state assessment data, and that CDE's dropout and graduation data are inconsistent with the CD BOCES records.	Partial Approval	The district's first request for a rating change was based on participation rates. CD BOCES found more instances of parent excuses than previously reported due to miscoding of the assessment data. CDE reviewed the data put forward and the accountability participation rate would increase to over 95% and the district would no longer receive the penalty of "decreased due to participation" raising the accreditation rating to Accredited with Priority Improvement: Low Participation. Due to the additional information put forward regarding parent excuses, the second participation request regarding aggregating participation rates was no longer relevant. The district's second request was based on internal assessment data from iReady and Scantron. CDE reviewed the iReady data submitted by the district and determined that CDE would accept the K-2 achievement data as well as K-3 growth data, as this data supplements and does not supplant the state data. Some of the subgroup data was not considered due to participation rates of below 95%, N <16 students, and/or decrease in students tested from fall to spring. Scantron data was submitted for PARCC tested grade levels, but CDE does not consider these data, as it is not supplemental to the state tested grades. After review with consideration of supplemental data, CD BOCES' overall points would increase but not to the extent necessary to reach a rating of Improvement. The CD BOCES third request was based on the dropout and graduation data being inaccurate. CDE data are reflective of the data submitted and certified by the BOCES, and thus won't be reconsidered. Even if accepted, the revised graduation and dropout rates would not raise the district rating enough to earn a higher rating.
Accountability and Data Analysis					Colorado Department of Education		December 15, 2016

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Body of Evidence	DE BEQUE 49JT	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited	DeBeque School District based their district request to reconsideration on additional DIBELS Next data submitted to the Department and that the District is only 0.4% away from the cut-point for an Accredited rating.	Approve	CDE reviewed the data submitted for DIBELS Next. The achievement levels for K-2 students performing at benchmark on DIBELS Next meets the targets set forth in the request to reconsider template. The elementary ELA supplemental achievement data supports a higher level of performance on the achievement indicator, which in turn impacts the overall district rating.
Body of Evidence, Online School	JULESBURG RE-1	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan	The district made its request based on two criteria regarding the district's online school: Destinations Career Academy of Colorado (CODCA). First, that CODCA's student population "overwhelms" the student population of other schools in Julesburg School District RE-1 and thus "the District level is not representative of the true performance of all schools comprising the District." Second, the district's accreditation level should change if CODCA's school plan type also changes.	Deny	CDE reviewed the request that the CODCA school data "overwhelms" the data included from the other schools in the district and that "this leads to a District Performance Framework Accreditation Rating that is not representative of the true academic performance of all the schools comprising the Julesburg School District." Unfortunately, this does not meet the conditions for a request to reconsider as Julesburg School District is the authorizer for CODCA and is subsequently held accountable for all of their authorized schools' student performance, regardless of school size and representation on the district performance framework.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Body of Evidence, Recalculation of Framework	KIOWA C-2	Accredited with Distinction	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited	KIOWA C-2 is a very small district with only three schools and the reconsideration of the elementary data has a large impact on the overall consideration for the district accreditation rating. The district requests the inclusion of 2015 PARCC data to be averaged with the Kiowa Elementary 2016 PARCC data. As in the past CDE produced both a one year and a three year performance framework and deferred to the framework that contained the highest number of performance indicators (or if both frameworks contained the same amount of performance indicators, it was deferred to the framework with the highest number of overall points). Additionally, Kiowa School District C-2 recommended consideration of the elementary NWEA MAP data for the district accreditation rating.	Deny	The district requested CDE use 2 years of CMAS PARCC data, based on the small size of the district. When CDE uses... When reviewing the body of evidence, the trend of the elementary data has not shown a positive three year trend, as demonstrated by higher scores and percentile ranks from the 2015 PARCC data compared to the 2016 PARCC data. In 2015, Kiowa Elementary was in the 72nd percentile overall on 2015 PARCC, while in 2016 the school received a Priority Improvement rating with a point value of 41.5%. The N count for the NWEA MAP data submitted is less than 16 students; therefore, CDE is unable to consider these data. Given that this data cannot be reviewed, the request to include NWEA MAP data was denied.
Body of Evidence	MANITOU SPRINGS 14	Accredited	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district made its request based on three criteria. First, the district provides information that it made growth between the last two years of accountability based on information from 2013 and 2014 District Performance Frameworks (DPFs). Second, the district shared the DIBELS Next, Star Reading, Star Early Literacy and Star Math data support strong academic achievement and growth in both Reading and Math. And finally, the district notes the only significant factor that has changed to affect the calculation of the DPF is the number of student participating. The significant decrease in participation may imply the state reported data is not representative of the true performance.	Approve	CDE reviewed the supplemental data submitted for both Math and Reading in DIBELS Next and STAR. With the exception of the group of students at risk for reading proficiency in second grade as indicated by the STAR Early Literacy results, the other targets were above the criteria set forth in the request to reconsider calculations for this assessment. The elementary ELA and Math supplemental achievement data supports a higher level of performance on the achievement indicator, which in turn impacts the overall district rating.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Body of Evidence	MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ RE-1	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan: Low Participation	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	The district requests that the district accreditation rating for 2016-17 be based solely on the academic performance and growth of the elementary schools and non-AEC charter schools, and the high school's postsecondary and workforce readiness data. The district requests the data from Cortez Middle School and Montezuma-Cortez High School be excluded from the calculations (due to low participation rates). With the removal of that data, the district requests an Accredited with Improvement plan rating.	Deny	The district is responsible for student performance in all authorized schools and cannot exclude those students from the district performance calculations. Furthermore, the request is based on selectively using the insufficient data argument for one school but not for another. In making a request to remove data from calculations based on insufficient state data, the application should consider all schools within the district meeting the same threshold. For example, KIVA Montessori had a participation rate of 63.6% in English Language Arts (ELA) and 61.4% in Math vs. Cortez Middle School's participation rate of 70.1% in ELA and 71.7% in Math. Given those schools have the same tested grades and similar participation rates, it is inconsistent to request data from one school be used and another school be excluded. Thus, the request to recalculate the district accreditation rating is denied. After review of the district's argument, CDE denies the district's request to change its accreditation rating to Improvement for the 2015-16 school year.
Body of Evidence, Matriculation data	THOMPSON R2-J	Accredited	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district provided additional matriculation data to the Department; which includes student that enlisted in the military, along with additional students identified as being enrolled in community college, four year institution, or CTE pathways not covered by available data sources.	Approve	The additional data put forward serves to increase the obtained points on the matriculation sub-indicator. The district provided a list of additional students with an identified matriculation pathway. The list serves as an assurance of military enlistment and college participation from the district. Through internal calculations, this supplemental data would warrant additional framework percentage points in the matriculation sub-indicator and post-secondary workforce readiness indicator, which leads to an Accredited: Low Participation rating.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Body of Evidence	WELD COUNTY S/D RE-8	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited	Weld County RE-8 School District requests to change the district accreditation rating to Accredited on the basis of reconsideration of the academic achievement performance indicators and growth and percentiles rankings by showing supplemental data at the lower elementary and high school levels.	Deny	CDE denies Weld County RE-8 Schools District's request per the following explanation. First, the presented Galileo growth data for the elementary grades tends to correspond with the patterns reflected within the District Performance Framework. For Math, the provided data appears to reveal growth rates lower than that reflected by the PARCC data. Similarly, no clear positive trends are evident to support a change in point assignment. Thus, the provided supplemental evidence does not appear to support a change to the obtained rating. Second, the presented growth data for high school fails to meet overall expectations based on Galileo benchmarks. And finally, the PSAT scores fail to reach the performance benchmarks for evidence-based reading/writing and math. Additionally, the provided data fails to meet the required 95% participation threshold that is necessary for consideration of supplemental data within requests.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Body of Evidence	WESTMINSTER 50	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan	The district made its request on a number of different criteria. First, the district explained that it is in the midst of implementing a new educational model, the Competency Based System (CBS). Second, the district explained that prior to the shift in state assessments they had reduced the number of schools in Priority Improvement and Turnaround from eighteen to two. The district also mentioned that they have seen an increasing trend of English learner achievement over the past five years, which has been a focus area for the district. Third, the district explains that external evaluation of district progress from the State Review Panel and AdvancED indicates that there has been a “high degree of dedication and commitment among all stakeholders involved with the system” in terms of implementing the CBS system. And finally, the district also submitted DIBELS, ACCESS and Scantron assessment data to demonstrate academic achievement and growth.	Deny	<p>Based on the information provided by the district and a review of the performance over time, CDE believes the initial accreditation rating is the most accurate description of performance for the district. The narrative presented did not describe how the supplemental data better reflects the district’s performance to move the district to a higher rating. While the request included supplemental reports with a number of different data resources, the narrative presented did not provide analysis or commentary on the Scantron, ACCESS, or DIBELS Next data. While supplemental data shows some higher performance, and implementation benchmarks are being met, it is not enough to assign the district an Improvement rating.</p> <p>The district also focused on the trend data from 2010 to 2014. The district did see significant improvements from 2010 to 2014 (12 schools moved off the clock), and 2 additional schools moved off the clock from 2014 to 2016, there was a significant decrease in performance in 2016 as 8 new schools were identified as Priority Improvement or Turnaround.</p> <p>The District’s request also included a number of perspectives about the accountability system as rationale for a higher rating. The accountability system holds all districts to the same standards across the state, so expectations are the same for all students. The unique district context and instructional model is important context for the accountability clock pathways. However, when it comes to assigning accreditation ratings, which describe the performance of students within a district, it is not as relevant. In looking at the student performance for the district, an Accredited with Priority Improvement plan rating is warranted.</p>

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Single School in District	AGATE 300	Accredited	Insufficient State Data: Low Tested Population	Accredited	The district requests a reconsideration per State Board Rule 4.02 of the Administration of Statewide Accountability Measures. According to rule 4.02 the state may use the Public School performance evaluation framework described in Section 9.00, for districts with only a Single Public School.	Approve	Per 4.02, CDE may assign the district the accreditation category aligned with the school performance framework plan type of the single school in the district, Agate Elementary School. Agate Elementary School was accredited with a Performance Plan by Agate School District. CDE accredits the district with an Accredited rating.
Single School in District	MOUNTAIN BOCES	Accredited with AEC: Performance	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	Accredited with AEC: Performance	The district requests a reconsideration per State Board Rule 4.02 of the Administration of Statewide Accountability Measures. According to rule 4.02 the state may use the Public School performance evaluation framework described in Section 9.00, for districts with only a Single Public School.	Approve	Per 4.02, CDE assigns Mountain BOCES the accreditation category aligned with the school performance framework plan type of the single school, Yampah Mountain School. As an alternative education campus, Yampah Mountain School was assigned an AEC: Performance Plan. Thus, CDE is accrediting Mountain BOCES with an AEC: Performance rating.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Consolidation of Schools in District, Body of Evidence	MOUNTAIN VALLEY RE 1	Accredited	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	Accredited Low Participation	The district made a request for reconsideration of the district’s accreditation rating bas two criteria. First, that consolidation of Mountain Valley Elementary School, Mountain Valley Middle School and Mountain Valley High School into one Mountain Valley School for school performance frameworks and other reporting requirements. The three schools operate as one entity in the school district. Also the district requests CDE consider the NWEA and DIBELS data as they may be a more accurate reflection of the districts’ students’ current academic achievement and academic growth.	Deny	CDE reviewed the request to reconsider for the district and denies the request per the following explanation. The district requests a reconsideration per State Board Rule 4.02 of the Administration of Statewide Accountability Measures. According to rule 4.02 the state may use the Public School performance evaluation framework described in Section 9.00, for districts with only a Single Public School. The district requests we use the combined school plan for the district rating. After recalculation of the combined school plan, Mountain Valley School would receive an Improvement rating, and thus, the district would receive Accredited with Improvement Plan. This would not change the district accreditation rating and the request to change the accreditation rating to Accredited is denied. The district also requests CDE review NWEA and DIBELS data submitted over 3 years for the elementary, middle, and high school grades. CDE was able to review the elementary data for grades K-2 achievement, K-3 growth, and 10-12 achievement and growth as these grade levels do not supplant state tested grades. After review of the supplemental data submitted, CDE was not able to approve the request to reconsider to move the district to Accredited based on the following explanation. CDE reviewed all three years of data submitted. Due to small N sizes at the district, CDE was able to aggregate the grade levels and years submitted and determined the supplemental data showed the district as “approaching” or “does not meet” in the sub-indicator ratings, which reflects what is reported on the district performance framework. Thus, the request is denied.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
AEC Impact	ELIZABETH C-1	Accredited	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district requests flexibility per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01, where by removing the AEC student results from the DPF, the district moves up one rating and also that the district AEC(s) received an AEC: Performance rating or received an AEC: Improvement rating but the AEC performance indicators demonstrate improvement over time.	Approve	CDE calculated the District Performance Framework for the district with students enrolled in the Alternative Education Campus removed. The total percent of points earned on the DPF increased and improved the rating for the district one accreditation category. Additionally, the AEC received an AEC: Improvement Plan rating for 2016. Thus, the district meets the qualifications set forth under the guidance per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01 and CDE accepts the district's request for reconsideration.
AEC Impact	ENGLEWOOD 1	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district requests flexibility per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01, where by removing the AEC student results from the DPF, the district moves up one rating and also that the district AEC(s) received an AEC: Performance rating or received an AEC: Improvement rating but the AEC performance indicators demonstrate improvement over time.	Approve	CDE calculated the District Performance Framework for the district with students enrolled in the Alternative Education Campus removed. The total percent of points earned on the DPF increased and improved the rating for the district one accreditation category. Additionally, the AEC received an AEC: Performance Plan rating for 2016. Thus, the district meets the qualifications set forth under the guidance per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01 and CDE accepts the district's request for reconsideration.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
AEC Impact	FALCON 49	Accredited	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district requests flexibility per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01, where by removing the AEC student results from the DPF, the district moves up one rating and also that the district AEC(s) received an AEC: Performance rating or received an AEC: Improvement rating but the AEC performance indicators demonstrate improvement over time.	Deny	CDE staff calculated the impact of AEC(s) in the DPF calculations per the guidelines of 4.01 (D)(1) and although the district would move from “Accredited with Improvement: Low Participation” to “Accredited: Low Participation” as per the results of the AEC SPFs, the District would not meet the criteria per 4.01(D)(2). The District has two AECs: GOAL Academy and Patriot High School. Although GOAL Academy earned a Performance rating, Patriot High School earned an Improvement rating. Given the criteria of the law per 4.01(D)(2)(a) “the Alternative Education Campus(es) has/have been assigned by the State Board to implement a School Improvement Plan and the Alternative Education Campus(es) has/have demonstrated improved performance over time, as demonstrated by attainment on the Performance Indicators in the Alternative Education Campus evaluation framework”, and Patriot High School earned a Performance rating in 2014 and subsequently declined to an Improvement rating in 2016, the District does not qualify per SB13-517 and State Board Rules 4.01 (D).

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Participation Miscoding/ AEC Impact/ Insufficient Data	MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51	Accredited	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district submitted information to the department based on three criteria. First, the district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration. Second, the district also requested flexibility per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01, where by removing the AEC student results from the DPF, the district moves up one rating and also that the district AEC(s) received an AEC: Performance rating or received an AEC: Improvement rating but the AEC performance indicators demonstrate improvement over time. And finally, the district submitted a request for Insufficient Data on the grounds that participation on the state assessment was low and not representative of the population of students in the district.	Approve	<p>The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent refusals, students who withdrew before completion, and students who took an alternate assessment. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold. Therefore, the district would move to Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation</p> <p>CDE calculated the District Performance Framework for the district with students enrolled in the Alternative Education Campus removed. The total percent of points earned on the DPF increased and improved the rating for the district to Accredited. Additionally, the AEC received an AEC: Improvement Plan rating for 2016 (an increase from AEC: Priority Improvement in 2014). Thus, the district meets the qualifications set forth under the guidance per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01 and CDE accepts the district’s request for reconsideration. Therefore, the district would move to Accredited: Low Participation</p> <p>CDE reviewed the additional data put forward for the request for an Insufficient State Data: Low Participation rating including STAR Math, STAR Reading, iReady, and GPA. After reviewing the results the district submitted, CDE disagrees that the additional data is not representative as there was inconsistent performance between students participating/not participating on the state assessment. CDE believes Accredited: Low Participation is the most appropriate rating for the district this year.</p>

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
AEC Impact, Participation Miscoding	PLATEAU VALLEY 50	Accredited	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district requests flexibility per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01, where by removing the AEC student results from the DPF, the district moves up one rating and also that the district AEC(s) received an AEC: Performance rating or received an AEC: Improvement rating but the AEC performance indicators demonstrate improvement over time.	Partial Approval	<p>CDE calculated the District Performance Framework for the district with students enrolled in the Alternative Education Campus removed. The total percent of points earned on the DPF increased and improved the rating for the district one accreditation category. Additionally, the AEC received an AEC: Performance Plan rating for 2014. Thus, the district meets the qualifications set forth under the guidance per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01.</p> <p>The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent excusals of the state assessment. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district did not meet the 95% participation rate threshold.</p> <p>CDE denies the district's request of an Accredited rating but approves the district moving to Accredited with Improvement: Decreased Due to Participation.</p>
AEC Impact	SALIDA R-32	Accredited with Distinction	Accredited	Accredited with Distinction	The district requests flexibility per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01, where by removing the AEC student results from the DPF, the district moves up one rating and also that the district AEC(s) received an AEC: Performance rating or received an AEC: Improvement rating but the AEC performance indicators demonstrate improvement over time.	Approve	CDE calculated the District Performance Framework for the district with students enrolled in the Alternative Education Campus removed. The total percent of points earned on the DPF increased and improved the rating for the district one accreditation category. Additionally, the AEC received an AEC: Performance Plan rating for 2014. Thus, the district meets the qualifications set forth under the guidance per SB 13-217 and 1 CCR 301-1 4.01 and CDE accepts the district's request for reconsideration.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Remove Low Participation Flag, Recalculation of Framework	MONTE VISTA C-8	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	Accredited with Improvement Plan	The District asked that the Low Participation flag be removed from its accreditation rating based on recalculating the district participation rates due to middle school math and online parent opt-outs. The District also asked that the district plan type change contingent upon the school plan types changing.	Deny	<p>The Department considers requests that meet one or more of the conditions for a request to reconsider in assigning a different district accreditation category or school plan type from the initial rating given through the District or School Performance Framework (DPF/SPF) report. Requesting removal of the “Low Participation” flag falls outside of the criteria for a request to reconsider submission as the district accreditation rating would remain in “Improvement, ” although the department understands that this descriptor has an impact.</p> <p>The district also noted that the miscoded parent excusals at the middle school level should remove the “low participation” flag. Participation rates and the “low participation” flag is based on actual participation rates, even if students do not participate due to parent excusals. The “Low participation” flag is included to help people understand the representativeness of the data included in the report. Fixing parent excusal coding does not impact the “Low participation” flag. Thus, the request to remove the low participation rate designation is not applicable based on existing policy. Furthermore, the school plan types did not impact a reexamination of the district plan type. Therefore CDE does not approve this request.</p>

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Remove Low Participation Flag	PEYTON 23 JT	Accredited	Accredited: Low Participation	Accredited	The District asked that the Low Participation flag be removed from its accreditation rating. The district noted several miscoding instances at the middle school level should remove the “low participation” flag. Those students were miscoded because they withdrew from the district before the test window, students were taking other assessments, or were part-time public or home-schooled.	Deny	The Department considers requests that meet one or more of the conditions for a request to reconsider in assigning a different district accreditation category or school plan type from the initial rating given through the District or School Performance Framework (DPF/SPF) report. Requesting removal of the “Low Participation” flag falls outside of the criteria for a request to reconsider submission as the district accreditation rating would remain in “Accredited, ” although the department understands that this descriptor has an impact. Participation rates and the “low participation” flag is based on actual participation rates, even if students do not participate due to other reasons. The “Low participation” flag is included to help people understand the representativeness of the data included in the report. Thus, the request to remove the low participation rate designation is not applicable based on existing policy.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Remove Low Participation Flag	PLATTE CANYON 1	Accredited with Distinction	Accredited with Distinction: Low Participation	Accredited with Distinction	The District asked that the Low Participation flag be removed from its accreditation rating based on miscoding of parent excuses experienced at two schools.	Deny	The Department considers requests that meet one or more of the conditions for a request to reconsider in assigning a different district accreditation category or school plan type from the initial rating given through the District or School Performance Framework (DPF/SPF) report. Requesting removal of the “Low Participation” flag falls outside of the criteria for a request to reconsider submission as the district accreditation rating would remain in “Distinction,” although the department understands that this descriptor has an impact. Participation rates and the “low participation” flag is based on actual participation rates, even if students do not participate due to parent excusals. The “Low participation” flag is included to help people understand the representativeness of the data included in the report. Fixing parent excusal coding does not impact the “Low participation” flag. Thus, the request to remove the low participation rate designation is not applicable based on existing policy.
Insufficient State Data	DOLORES COUNTY RE NO.2	Accredited	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Insufficient State Data: Low Participation	The District submitted the request on the grounds that participation on the state assessment was low and not representative of the population of students in the district. Participation on the English language arts exam was 14.3%, Math exam: 13.6%, Science exam: 12.5%, and ACT exam: 97.6%. The district expressed concerns regarding data privacy due to the low number of students that took the test; it might be possible to identify those students’ test scores. The district also mentioned how there may have been some confusion when the district was coding test booklets.	Approve	CDE acknowledges the district’s concerns and, given the low number of students in the district that participated in the assessment, accepts the request to change the district’s rating to Insufficient State Data: Low Participation.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Insufficient State Data	LA VETA RE-2	Accredited with Distinction	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	Insufficient State Data: Low Participation	The district submitted the request on the grounds that participation on the state assessment was low and not representative of the population of students in the district. Participation on the ELA exam was 74.6%, Math exam: 75.2%, Science exam: 68.8%, and ACT exam: 100.0%. Additionally, the district submitted an analysis of 3rd and 4th grade CMAS PARCC ELA and Math results, as well as NWEA MAP for the parents who excused their students from the CMAS PARCC exams.	Approve	CDE acknowledges the district's concerns and, given the low number of students in the district who participated in the assessment, accepts the request to change the district's rating to Insufficient State Data: Low Participation.
Insufficient State Data	DOLORES RE-4A	Accredited	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan: Low Participation	Insufficient State Data: Low Participation	The district submitted the request on the grounds that participation on the state assessment was low and not representative of the population of students in the district. Participation on the English language arts exam was 84.8%, Math exam: 85.8%, Science exam: 66.2%, and ACT exam: 100.0%.	Approve	CDE acknowledges the district's concerns and, given the low number of students in the district who participated in the assessment and accepts the request to change the district's rating to Insufficient State Data: Low Participation.
Participation Miscoding/ Insufficient State Data	PRIMERO REORGANIZED 2	Accredited with Distinction	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation or Insufficient State Data	The District submitted the request on the grounds that participation on the state assessment was low and not representative of the population of students in the district. The District also submitted additional miscoding data provided to the Department which contained parent refusals that were not properly coded initially during the assessment administration.	Partial Approval	CDE acknowledges the District's concerns but disagrees with the district's request for Insufficient State Data: Low Participation as 94.1% or more students participated in the state assessments, which is a representative sample. The additional miscoding data the District provided to the department contained parent refusals. With these students recoded and removed from the District's participation rate, the District met the 95% participation rate threshold. CDE approves Primero Reorganized School District 2's request to move to Accredited based on the additional miscoded participation data provided to the department.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Participation Miscoding	ASPEN 1	Accredited with Distinction	Accredited: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited with Distinction: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Deny	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent excusals of the state assessment. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district did not meet the 95% participation rate threshold.
Participation Miscoding	BRANSON REORGANIZED 82	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional miscoded data provided contained parent refusals and students who withdrew before completion. The data also contained students who were initially identified as misadministrations; for the purposes of the revised participation rate, these students' codes were changed to participants. With these students recoded, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.
Participation Miscoding	BUFFALO RE-4J	Accredited	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent excusals of the state assessment and students who took an alternate assessment. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.
Participation Miscoding	BYERS 32J	Accredited	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent excusals of the state assessment and students who withdrew before completion. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.
Participation Miscoding	EDISON 54 JT	Accredited with Distinction	Accredited: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited with Distinction: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent excusals of the state assessment. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Participation Miscoding	FRENCHMAN RE-3	Accredited with Distinction	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent excusals of the state assessment. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.
Participation Miscoding	GARFIELD 16	Accredited	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent refusals, students who withdrew before completion, expelled students, and students with medical exemptions on the state assessment. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.
Participation Miscoding	GENOA-HUGO C113	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of students who withdrew before completion. Your data also contained students who were initially identified as misadministrations; for the purposes of the revised participation rate, these students' codes were changed to participants. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.
Participation Miscoding	HAXTUN RE-2J	Accredited	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent excusals of the state assessment. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Participation Miscoding	HAYDEN RE-1	Accredited	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent refusals, students who withdrew before completion, and students who took an alternate assessment. The data also contained students who were initially identified as misadministrations; for the purposes of the revised participation rate, these students' codes were changed to participants. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.
Participation Miscoding	HUERFANO RE-1	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited with Turnaround Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited with Priority Improvement: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent excusals of the state assessment. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.
Participation Miscoding	LIBERTY J-4	Accredited	Accredited: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited with Distinction: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent refusals, students who withdrew before completion, and students who had medical exemptions. The data also contained students who were initially identified as misadministrations; for the purposes of the revised participation rate, these students' codes were changed to participants. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.
Participation Miscoding	NORTH PARK R-1	Accredited	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent refusals and students who withdrew before completion. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.

Request Type	District	Accreditation Rating (2014)	CDE Initial Rating (2016)	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Participation Miscoding	NORWOOD R-2J	Accredited	Accredited with Improvement Plan: Decreased due to Participation	Accredited: Low Participation	The district submitted additional information to the department to correct miscoding of student assessments experienced during the state assessment administration.	Approve	The additional data provided to the department was in regards to participation miscoding of parent refusals and students who withdrew before completion. With these students recoded and removed from the accountability participation rate, the district met the 95% participation rate threshold.